

## REMARKS

### I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-5 are pending in the above-identified patent application and claims 6-10 are withdrawn from consideration.

The Examiner makes the Restriction Requirement mailed on February 15, 2005 final.

The Examiner suggests a new title of the invention.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA") in view of Asao et al. U.S. Patent 6,147,431 (hereinafter "Asao") or vice versa.

The Examiner further rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Asao and further in view of Fritzsche U.S. Patent 4,914,934 (hereinafter "Fritzsche").

The Examiner objects to claims 3 and 4 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

### II. Summary of Applicants' Reply to Office Action

Applicants have amended the title of the invention and claim 1. Applicants have also cancelled claims 6-10, which were previously withdrawn. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

### III. The Title of the Invention

The Examiner in the Office Action suggests a new title of the invention based on the preamble of the sole independent claim pending in this application. Applicants have amended the title in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

### IV. The Rejections of Claims 1, 2, and 5

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Asao or vice versa. The Examiner further rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Asao and further in view of Fritzsche. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of forming a hollow cylindrical dynamo-electric machine stator core. The method includes supplying first and second strips of source material. Pressure is applied to the first strip in order to modify an axial length dimension of that strip. The first strip is helically coiled to produce a first helical coil. The second strip is helically coiled to produce a second helical coil. The first and second helical coils are assembled to produce the stator core.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further specify helically coiling the first strip "after applying the pressure to

the first strip." Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 19, lines 10-33 of applicants' specification and in FIG. 15.

The AAPA states that it has been known to axially combine two helically formed strips to form a stator core (see page 3, lines 9-19 of applicants' specification). Asao refers to integrating a wound strip lamination (i.e., a helical coil) in part "by applying pressure to it from above and below" (col. 3:35-36 of Asao).

The Examiner contends that it would be obvious "to combine the teachings of the AAPA and Asao by applying the pressure to the strip laminations or the first and second strip laminations, as taught by [Asao], to the wound strip laminations of the AAPA in order to compact the stator core for caulking or welding" (page 4, lines 7-9 of the Office Action). However, even if it were obvious to combine the teachings of the AAPA and Asao, such a combination would fail to show or suggest applicant's claimed invention.

Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, specifies that the first strip material is helically coiled after applying pressure to the first strip. This is in stark contrast to the combination of the AAPA and Asao, which would result in strips being helically coiled before applying pressure to strips. Therefore, the combination of the AAPA and Asao fails to show or

suggest helically coiling a first strip after applying pressure to the first strip as specified by applicants' amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicants submit that independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2 and 5, are patentable. Therefore, applicants request that the rejections of claims 1, 2, and 5 be withdrawn.

#### V. The Objection to Claims 3 and 4

The Examiner objects to claims 3 and 4 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 4, and hereby expressly reserve the right to rewrite those claims in independent form should the base claims not ultimately be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, independent claim 1, from which claims 3 and 4 depend, is allowable, and therefore claims 3 and 4 are allowable. Accordingly, applicants request that the objection to claims 3 and 4 be withdrawn.

#### VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance. This application is therefore in condition for

allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "James A. Leiz", is written over a horizontal line.

James A. Leiz  
Reg. No. 46,109  
Attorney for Applicants  
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020-1105  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000  
Fax: (212) 596-9090